

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

New claim 21 is currently being amended. Support for this amendment can be found at least in FIGs. 4-6 and in the specification on page 8, lines 1-6, and page 13, lines 14-21.

This amendment adds a claim in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1, 3-7, and 9-21 are now pending in this application.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-7 and 9-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0169160 to Barros et al. (hereafter “Barros”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,520,690 to Chu (hereafter “Chu”). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 1, 19 and 20 are all directed to an outside mirror for a vehicle comprising “an image capturing unit”, “a visible-light emitting unit that emits visible light”, and wherein “the visible-light emitting unit is arranged such that the visible light emitted does not directly enter into the image capturing unit.” Barros does not disclose this combination of features where “the visible-light emitting unit is arranged such that the visible light emitted does not directly enter into the image capturing unit.”

The Office Action appears to recognize that Barros does not disclose the arrangement of claim 1 where “the visible-light emitting unit is arranged such that the visible light emitted does not directly enter into the image capturing unit”, but on page 2 supplies Chu for teaching an arrangement where “the visible-light emitting unit is arranged such that the visible light emitted does not directly enter into the image capturing unit.” Applicant submits, however, that Chu does not cure the deficiencies of Barros.

Chu discloses a rearview mirror structure with a camera lens 3 and a bulb 31. The signal of the camera lens 3 is transmitted to a display preset in the car, whereby the view of a dead corner in front of the car can be seen in the display (col. 2, lines 42-44). The bulb 31 is arranged beside the camera lens 3 to provide auxiliary illumination for more clearly showing the view of the dead corner on the front side (col. 2, lines 44-47).

Chu, however, does not suggest that any visible-light emitting units of the Barros rear-view mirror should have an arrangement relative to any camera (image capturing unit) in the Barros rear-view mirror where the visible-light emitting unit is arranged such that the visible light emitted does not directly enter into the camera. Chu merely suggests that a bulb should be added to provide further illumination of an image received by the camera. Chu does not suggest that the visible-light emitting units of Barros should all be arranged such that their light does not directly enter into a camera of the Barros device. Thus, even if Barros were modified according to the teaching of Chu, the result would not have all the features of claims 1, 19 and 20.

The dependent claims ultimately depend from claim 1, and are patentable for at least the same reasons, as well as for further patentable features recited therein. For example, new claim 21 recites “the image capturing unit captures information in an image capturing range, and the infrared emitting unit includes an infrared radiation distribution controller that controls distribution of the infrared radiation emitted within a predetermined range which is substantially the same as or wider than the image capturing range.” Nowhere does Chu or Barros disclose this arrangement of the image capturing unit relative to an infrared emitting unit as recited in claim 1.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date March 19, 2007

By Thomas G. Bilodeau

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 945-6162
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Pavan K. Agarwal
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,888

Thomas G. Bilodeau
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,438